arXiv:1205.1223v3 [cs.SC] 17 Aug 2012

Proving Inequalities and Solving Global Optimization Problems via Simplified CAD Projection

Jingjun Han * Zhi Jin Bican Xia

LMAM & School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

---

Abstract

Let $X_n = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n, k]$. The problem of finding all k such that $f(X_n, k) \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is considered in this paper, which obviously takes as a special case the problem of computing the global infimum or proving the semi-definiteness of a polynomial. For solving the problems we propose a simplified Brown's CAD projection operator, called `Nproj`, of which the projection scale is always no larger than that of Brown's. For many problems, especially when $n \geq 3$, the scale of `Nproj` is much smaller than that of Brown's. As a result, the lifting phase is also simplified. Some new algorithms based on `Nproj` for solving those problems are designed and proved to be correct. Comparison to some existing tools on some examples is reported to illustrate the effectiveness of our new algorithms.

Key words: CAD projection, global optimization, semi-definiteness, polynomials.

---

1. Introduction

Let's consider the following three well-known problems.

Problem 1. For $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, prove or disprove $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n (f(X_n) \geq 0)$.

Problem 2. For $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, find the global infimum $\inf f(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Problem 3. For $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n, k]$, find all $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n (f(X_n, k) \geq 0)$.

A lot of work has been done for Problem 1 since Hilbert (Hilbert, 1888). For related classical results, see for example, Bernstein (1915); Artin (1927); Pólya (1928); Hardy

---

* Corresponding author.

Email addresses: `hanjingjunfdfz@gmail.com` (Jingjun Han), `j2i5nzhi@sina.com` (Zhi Jin), `xbc@math.pku.edu.cn` (Bican Xia).

[1] This research was partly supported by the Headmaster's Scholarship for Undergraduate Students of Peking University, the project SYSKF1207 from SKLCS, Chinese Academy of Sciences and the ANR-NSFC project EXACTA (ANR-09-BLAN-0371-01/60911130369).

et al. (1952); Motzkin (1952); Motzkin et al. (1969); Berg et al. (1982). In recent years, many other methods have been proposed. See for example, Putinar (1993); Schweighofer (2005); Yang (2005); Scheiderer (2009); Yao (2010); Castle (2011); Xu et al. (2012).

Problem 2 can be regarded as a generalization of Problem 1. Various methods based on different principles have been proposed for solving Problem 2, including methods based on Gröbner base (Hägglöf et al., 1995; Hanzon, 2003), semi-definite programming, SOS based methods (Parrilo, 2000; Lasserre, 2001; Jibetean et al., 2005; Nie et al., 2006; Safey, 2008; Hà et al., 2009; Guo et al., 2010), and methods based on Wu's method (Xiao et al., 2011). Semi-definite programming is based on symbolic-numerical computation and it returns numerical solution. Furthermore, in some cases it may return value larger than the supremum. Some methods need additional assumptions, for example: assuming that the polynomial can attain the infimum (Nie et al., 2006) or assuming that the zero of the set of the first partial derivatives is zero-dimensional (Hägglöf et al., 1995).

Problem 3 is more general. It is a typical problem of quantifier elimination on real closed field. Therefore, theoretically it is feasible to apply the algorithm of Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition(CAD) (Collins, 1975, 1998; Collins et al., 1991). The original CAD algorithm is of high complexity since the algorithm process of CAD projection phase involves a large amount of resultant calculation and the lifting phase needs to choose a sample point in every cell. Hence a lot of work tries to improve the CAD projection. A well known improvement is Hong's projection operator which is applicable in all cases (Hong, 1990). For many problems, a smaller projection operator given by McCallum (1988, 1998), with an improvement by Brown (2001), is more efficient. Strzeboński (2000) proposed the algorithm of Generic Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition(GCAD) for solving systems of strict polynomial inequalities, which made use of the so-called generic projection, the same projection operator as Brown (2001) proposed later. Based on Wu's principle of finite kernel (Wu, 1998, 2003), Yang proposed without proof the successive resultant method (Yang, 2001; Yang et al., 2008) to solve the global optimization problem, in which Brown's projection is used in the projection phase and only sample points from the highest dimensional cells need to be chosen in the lifting phase. McCallum (1993) once pointed out that in order to prove a polynomial inequality, we need to choose sample points only from the highest dimensional cells, but he did not use the Brown projection. Xiao (2009) proved that, in terms of the Brown projection, at least one sample point can be taken from every highest dimensional cell via the Open CAD lifting. The algorithms proposed in this paper will also use this conclusion.

In this paper, we simplify the Brown projection in order to solve Problems 1, 2 and 3 more efficiently. In fact, we propose a simplified Brown's CAD projection operator, called `Nproj`, of which the projection scale is always no larger than that of Brown's. For many problems, especially when $n \geq 3$, the scale of `Nproj` is much smaller than that of Brown's. As a result, the lifting phase is also simplified. Some new algorithms based on `Nproj` are designed and proved to be correct. Comparison to some existing tools on some examples is reported to illustrate the effectiveness of our new algorithms. In order to prove the correctness of our algorithms, we find an interesting property: for $h, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ with $\gcd(h(X_n), g(X_n)) = 1$ and a connected open set U in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(h, g)$ is also a connected open set, where $\mathrm{Zero}(h, g)$ means the set of common real roots of h and g.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces basic definitions, lemmas and concepts of CAD and Brown's projection. Section 3 proves the correctness of the successive resultant method proposed in Yang (2001). In Section 4 and Section 5, our new projection operator `Nproj` is introduced and a new complete algorithm based on `Nproj` is proposed for solving the above three problems. The correctness of our algorithm is proved. The last section includes several examples which demonstrate the process and effectiveness of our algorithm.

2. Preliminaries

In this paper, if not specified, for a positive integer n, X_n, Y_n, A_n, B_n and $\mathbf{0}_n$ denote the point $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $(b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $(0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively.

Definition 1. For $X_n, Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the Euclidean distance of X_n and Y_n is defined by

$$\rho(X_n, Y_n) := \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(x_i - y_i)^2}.$$

Definition 2. For $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $B_{X_n}(r)$ be the open ball which centered in X_n with radius r, that is

$$B_{X_n}(r) := \{Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \rho(X_n, Y_n) < r\}.$$

Definition 3. Let $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, the set of real zeros of f is denoted by $\mathrm{Zero}(f)$. Let L be a subset of $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. Define

$$\mathrm{Zero}(L) = \{X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n | \forall f \in L, f(X_n) = 0\}.$$

The elements of $\mathrm{Zero}(L)$ are the common real zeros of L.

Definition 4. The level for $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ is the largest j such that $\deg(f, x_j) > 0$ where $\deg(f, x_j)$ is the degree of f with respect to x_j. The level for $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n, k]$ is the largest j such that $\deg(f, x_j) > 0$ and the level is zero if f is a polynomial in k.

Definition 5. For polynomial set $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ or $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}[X_n, k]$, L^i is the set of polynomials in L with level i.

Definition 6. For $X_n, Y_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by X_nY_n the segment $X_n \to Y_n$. For $X_n^0, X_n^1, \ldots, X_n^k$, we denote by$X_n^0 \to X_n^1 \to \cdots \to X_n^k$ the broken line through $X_n^0, X_n^1, \ldots, X_n^k$ in turn.

The following two lemmas are well-known results.

Lemma 7. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, there exist $A, B \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ such that $Af + Bg = \mathrm{Res}(f, g, x_n)$ with $\deg(A, x_n) < \deg(g, x_n)$ and $\deg(B, x_n) < \deg(f, x_n)$, where $\mathrm{Res}(f, g, x_n)$ is the resultant of f and g with respect to x_n.*

Lemma 8. *Let $f(X_n) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ and r be a real positive number. If $f = 0$ for all $X_n \in B_{\mathbf{0}_n}(r)$, then $f \equiv 0$.*

For convenience, we denote by (f, g) the greatest common divisor of f and g in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$.

Lemma 9. *For $f, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, if f and g are coprime, then after any linear invertible transform, f and g are still coprime, namely for $A \in GL_n(\mathbb{R})$, $X_n^{*T} = AX_n^T + B_n^T$, then $(f(X_n^*), g(X_n^*)) = 1$.*

Proof. *If $(f(X_n^*), g(X_n^*)) = h(X_n)$ and h is not a constant. Then $h(A^{-1}(X_n - B_n^T))$ is a non-trivial common divisor of f and g in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$, which is a contradiction.* $\square$

Lemma 10. *Suppose $f, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ and $(f, g) = 1$. For any $X_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $r > 0$, there exists $X'_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $\rho(X_{n-1}, X'_{n-1}) < r$ and for all $x'_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $(X'_{n-1}, x'_n) \notin \mathrm{Zero}\,(f, g)$.*

Proof. *Otherwise, there exist $X^0_{n-1} = (x^0_1, x^0_2, \ldots, x^0_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $r_0 > 0$, such that for any $X_{n-1} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ satisfying $\rho(X^0_{n-1}, X_{n-1}) < r_0$, there exists an $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(X_n) = g(X_n) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Res}(f, g, x_n) = 0$ holds on $B_{r_0}(X^0_{n-1})$. From Lemma 8, we get that $\mathrm{Res}(f, g, x_n) = 0$ holds for all $X_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ meaning (f, g) is non-trivial, which is impossible.* $\square$

Definition 11. For $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, say

$$f(x) = a_l x^l + \cdots + a_0, a_l \neq 0.$$

The discriminant of $f(x)$ is

$$\mathrm{discrim}(f, x) = a_l^{2l-2} \prod_{i<j} (z_i - z_j)^2,$$

where z_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, l)$ are the complex roots of the equation $f(x) = 0$.

The following well-known equation shows the relationship between $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x)$ and $\mathrm{Res}(f, f'_x, x)$,

$$a_l \mathrm{discrim}(f, x) = (-1)^{\frac{l(l-1)}{2}} \mathrm{Res}(f, f'_x, x).$$

For real parametric polynomial $f(X_n, x)$, if the *leading coefficient* $\mathrm{lc}(f, x) \not\equiv 0$, the discriminant of $f(X_n, x)$ can be written as

$$\mathrm{discrim}(f, x) := (-1)^{\frac{l(l-1)}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{l-1} & a_{l-2} & \cdots & a_j & \cdots \\ 0 & a_l & a_{l-1} & \cdots & a_{j+1} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & a_l & \cdots & a_{j+2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \\ l & (l-1)a_{l-1} & (l-2)a_{l-2} & \cdots & ja_j & \cdots \\ 0 & la_l & (l-1)a_{l-1} & \cdots & (j+1)a_{j+1} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & la_l & \cdots & (j+2)a_{j+2} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $a_l = a_{l-1} = 0$ at point X_n, from the above expression, $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x)$ equals 0 at this point.

Lemma 12. *(Weiss, 1963) Let* $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ *be a monic squarefree polynomial of degree* l, *the sign of its discriminant is* $(-1)^{\frac{l-r}{2}}$, *where* r *is the number of its real roots.*

It is clear that the conclusion of the above lemma still holds when $\mathrm{lc}(f, x)$ is positive.

Lemma 13. *Given a polynomial* $f(X_n, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n, x_{n+1}]$, *say*

$$f(X_n, x_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{l} a_i x_{n+1}^i, a_l \not\equiv 0,$$

where a_i *is a polynomial in* $X_n (i = 0, 1, \dots, l)$. *Let* U *be an open set in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. *If* $f(X_n, x_{n+1}) \geq 0$ *on* $U \times \mathbb{R}$, *then there exists a positive integer* m *such that* $l = 2m$ *and*

$$(-1)^m \mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1}) \geq 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{lc}(f, x_{n+1}) \geq 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad X_n \in U.$$

Proof. Obviously, $l = \deg(f, x_{n+1})$ is even and $\mathrm{lc}(f, x_{n+1})$ is positive semi-definite on $U \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $l = 2m$ for some positive integer m. For any given $X_n \in U$, if $f(X_n, x_{n+1})$ has square factors, then $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1}) = 0$. Since f is positive semi-definite, if $a_l = 0$ at X_n, then $a_{l-1} = 0$ at X_n. Thus $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1}) = 0$ at X_n. Now, suppose f is squarefree and $a_l \neq 0$ at X_n. Because f is positive semi-definite, f has no real roots. By Lemma 12, the sign of $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})$ is $(-1)^m$ at X_n. That completes the proof. □

Definition 14. Suppose $h \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ can be factorized in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$ as:

$$h = {h_1}^{i_1} {h_2}^{i_2} \dots {h_m}^{i_m},$$

where $h_i (i = 1, \dots, m)$ are pairwise different irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. Define

$$\mathrm{sqrfree}(h) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} h_i.$$

Lemma 15. *(Yang et al., 2008) Given a real polynomial* f *with real parameters, say*

$$f(\mathbf{a}, x) = a_m x^m + a_{m-1} x^{m-1} + \dots + a_0,$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_m, \dots, a_0)$ *is real parameter. Let* $R(\mathbf{a}) = \mathrm{sqrfree}(\mathrm{Res}(f, f', x))$. *If* c_1 *and* c_2 *are two points in the same connected component of parameter space* $R(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0$, *then* $f(\mathbf{c_1}, x)$ *and* $f(\mathbf{c_2}, x)$ *have the same number of real roots* $y_1(\mathbf{c_1}) < y_2(\mathbf{c_1}) < \dots < y_d(\mathbf{c_1})$ *and* $y_1(\mathbf{c_2}) < y_2(\mathbf{c_2}) < \dots < y_d(\mathbf{c_2})$. *Moreover,* $y_i(\mathbf{a}) (i = 1, 2, \dots, d)$ *is continuous in the connected component.*

In the following, we introduce some basic concepts and results of CAD. The reader is referred to Collins (1975), Hong (1990), McCallum (1988, 1998), Brown (2001) and Xiao (2009) for a detailed discussion on the properties of CAD and Open CAD.

Definition 16. (Collins, 1975; McCallum, 1988) An n-variate polynomial $f(X_{n-1}, x_n)$ over the reals is said to be delineable on a subset S (usually connected) of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ if (1) the portion of the real variety of f that lies in the cylinder $S \times \mathbb{R}$ over S consists of the union of the graphs of some $k \geq 0$ continuous functions $\theta_1 < \dots < \theta_k$ from S to $\mathbb{R}$; and (2) there exist integers $m_1, \dots, m_k \geq 1$ such that for every $a \in S$, the multiplicity of the root $\theta_i(a)$ of $f(a, x_n)$ (considered as a polynomial in x_n alone) is m_i.

Definition 17. (Collins, 1975; McCallum, 1988) In the above definition, the θ_i are called the real root functions of f on S, the graphs of the θ_i are called the f-sections over S, and the regions between successive f-sections are called f-sectors.

Theorem 18. *(McCallum, 1988, 1998) Let $f(X_n, x_{n+1})$ be a polynomial in $\mathbb{R}[X_n, x_{n+1}]$ of positive degree and* $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})$ *is a nonzero polynomial. Let S be a connected submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ on which f is degree-invariant and does not vanish identically, and in which* $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})$ *is order-invariant. Then f is analytic delineable on S and is order-invariant in each f-section over S.*

Based on this theorem, McCallum proposed the projection operator MCproj, which consists of the discriminant of f and all coefficients of f.

Theorem 19. *(Brown, 2001) Let $f(X_n, x_{n+1})$ be a $(n+1)$-variate polynomial of positive degree m in the variable x_{n+1} with* $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1}) \neq 0$*. Let S be a connected submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in which* $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})$ *is order-invariant, the leading coefficient of f is sign-invariant, and such that f vanishes identically at no point in S. f is degree-invariant on S.*

Based on this theorem, Brown obtained a reduced McCallum projection in which only leading coefficients, discriminants and resultants appear. The Brown projection operator is defined as follows.

Definition 20. (Brown, 2001) Given a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_{n+1}]$ with level $n+1$, the Brown projection operator for f is

$$\mathrm{Bproj}(f, x_{n+1}) = \mathrm{Res}(\mathrm{sqrfree}(f), \frac{\partial(\mathrm{sqrfree}(f))}{\partial x_{n+1}}, x_{n+1}).$$

If L is a polynomial set and the level of any polynomial in L is $n+1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Bproj}(L, x_{n+1}) = & \bigcup_{f \in L} \{\mathrm{Res}(\mathrm{sqrfree}(f), \frac{\partial(\mathrm{sqrfree}(f))}{\partial x_{n+1}}, x_{n+1})\} \\ & \bigcup \bigcup_{f,g \in L, f \neq g} \{\mathrm{Res}(\mathrm{sqrfree}(f), \mathrm{sqrfree}(g), x_{n+1})\}.\end{aligned}$$

```
Algorithm 1. Bprojection (Brown, 2001)
Input: A polynomial $f(X_n) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$.
Output: A projection factor set $F$.
$F := \{f(X_n)\}$;
for $i$ from $n$ downto 2 do
    $F := F \bigcup \{\mathrm{Bproj}(F^i, x_i)\}$; ($F^i$ is the set of polynomials in $F$ with level $i$).
end for
return $F$
```

Open CAD is a modified CAD construction algorithm, which was named in Rong Xiao's Ph.D. thesis (Xiao, 2009). In fact, Open CAD is similar to the Generic Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (GCAD) proposed by Strzeboński (2000) and was used in

DISCOVERER (Xia, 2000) for real root classification. For convenience, we describe the framework of the Open CAD here.

For a polynomial $f(X_n) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, an Open CAD defined by $f(X_n)$ is a set of sample points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ obtained through the following three phases: (1) Projection. Use the Brown projection operator (Algorithm 1) on $f(X_n)$; (2) Base. Choose one point in each of the open intervals defined by the real roots of F^1 (see Algorithm 1); (3) Lifting. Substitute each sample point of $\mathbb{R}^{i-1}$ for X_{i-1} in F^i and then, by the same method as Base phase, choose sample points for $F^i(x_i)$.

3. The Successive Resultant Method

The Successive Resultant Method (SRes) is introduced in (Yang, 2001) without a proof. The method can be used for solving Problem 2 of this paper, i.e., problem of global optimization.

For a polynomial $f(X_n)$ in Problem 2, the SRes method first applies Brown's projection recursively on polynomial $f(X_n)-K$ to get a polynomial $g(K)$. Suppose $g(K)$ has m distinct real roots $k_i (1 \le i \le m)$. Then computes $m+1$ rational numbers $p_i (0 \le i \le m)$ such that $k_i \in (p_{i-1}, p_i)$. Finally, substitutes each p_i for K in $f(X_n) - K$ to check if $f(X_n) - p_i \ge 0$ holds for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}$. If p_j is the first such that $f(X_n) - p_j \ge 0$ does not hold for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}$, then k_j is the infimum ($k_0 = -\infty$). To check if $f(X_n) - p_i \ge 0$ holds for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}$, the SRes method applies Brown's projection on $f(X_n) - p_i$ and choose sample points only from the highest dimensional cells in the lifting phase.

The SRes method is formally described as Algorithm 2 and we will prove its correctness in the rest parts of the section.

Algorithm 2. `SRes` (Successive Resultant Method, Yang (2001); Yang et al. (2008))

Input: A squarefree polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$.

Output: The supremum of $k \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(X_n) \ge k$. If there doesn't exist such k, then returns $-\infty$.

```
 1: $F := Bprojection(f - k)$ ($F^i$ is the set of polynomials in $F$ with level $i$. Here $F^i$ has no more than one polynomial, we denote this polynomial by $F_i$.);
 2: $C_0$ :=an Open CAD of $\mathbb{R}$ defined by $F_0$ (Suppose $C_0 = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} p_i$, $p_i \in (k_i, k_{i+1})$, where $k_i$ $(1 \le i \le m)$ are the real roots of $F_0$ and $k_0 = -\infty$, $k_{m+1} = +\infty$.);
 3: for $l$ from 0 to $m$ do
 4:     for $i$ from 1 to $n$ do
 5:         $C_{li}$:= an Open CAD of $\mathbb{R}^i$ defined by $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i} F_j$ and $k = p_l$;
 6:     end for
 7:     if $\exists X_n \in C_{ln}$, s.t. $f(X_n, p_l) < 0$ then
 8:         return $k_l$
 9:     end if
10: end for
```

Remark 21. If $g(X_n) \ge 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, Algorithm 2 can also be applied to compute $\inf\{\frac{f(X_n)}{g(X_n)} | X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$. We just need to replace $F := Bprojection(f - k)$ of step 1 by $F := Bprojection(f - kg)$. The proof of the correctness is the same.

We first prove the following lemma, which can be inferred from the results of (Brown, 2001) and (McCallum, 1998), namely f is delineable over the maximal connected regions defined by $\mathrm{Bproj}(f, x_n) \neq 0$. Since the proof is inspiring, we will present it here.

Lemma 22. *(McCallum, 1998; Brown, 2001) Let* F_i, F_{i-1} *be as in Algorithm 2. Let* U *be a connected component of* $F_{i-1} \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{i-1}$ *and* $y_i^1(\gamma) < y_i^2(\gamma) < \cdots < y_i^m(\gamma)$ *be all real roots of* $F_i(\gamma, x_i) = 0$ *for any given* $\gamma \in U$*. Then for all* $\alpha, \beta \in U$, $\alpha \times (y_i^{j-1}(\alpha), y_i^j(\alpha))$ *and* $\beta \times (y_i^{j-1}(\beta), y_i^j(\beta))(j = 2, 3, \dots, m)$ *are in the same connected component of* $F_i \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^i$*. Therefore, for any two points in* U*, their corresponding sample points obtained through the Open CAD lifting phase are in the same connected component of* $F_n \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^n$*.*

Proof. For $\alpha \in U$, let $\varepsilon = \min\limits_{2 \le i \le m} \mid y_i(\alpha) - y_{i-1}(\alpha) \mid$, by Lemma 15, $\exists \delta > 0$, such that $\forall \alpha' \in B(\alpha, \delta)$, $\max\limits_{1 \le i \le m} \mid y_i(\alpha) - y_i(\alpha') \mid < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$.

Consider segment $(\alpha, \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha)+y_j(\alpha)}{2}) \to (\alpha', \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha')+y_j(\alpha')}{2})$ where $\alpha' \in B(\alpha, \delta)$. For any point (α'', y) on the segment, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mid y - y_s(\alpha'') \mid \\
=& \mid (y_s(\alpha'') - y_s(\alpha)) + (y_s(\alpha) - \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha) + y_j(\alpha)}{2}) + (\frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha) + y_j(\alpha)}{2} - y) \mid \\
\ge& \mid y_s(\alpha) - \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha) + y_j(\alpha)}{2} \mid - \mid y_s(\alpha'') - y_s(\alpha) \mid - \mid \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha) + y_j(\alpha)}{2} - y \mid \\
\ge& \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{6} - \mid \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha) + y_j(\alpha)}{2} - \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha') + y_j(\alpha')}{2} \mid \\
\ge& \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - \frac{\varepsilon}{6} - \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \\
>& 0
\end{aligned}$$

So the points satisfying $F_i = 0$ are not on the segment.

Therefore, for any points $r_1 \in (y_{j-1}(\alpha), y_j(\alpha)), r_2 \in (y_{j-1}(\alpha'), y_j(\alpha')), (\alpha' \in B_\alpha(\delta))$, the points satisfying $F_i = 0$ are not on the broken line $(\alpha, r_1) \to (\alpha, \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha)+y_j(\alpha)}{2}) \to (\alpha', \frac{y_{j-1}(\alpha')+y_j(\alpha')}{2}) \to (\alpha', r_2)$.

Hence we know that for any $\alpha \in U$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any point $\alpha' \in B_\alpha(\delta)$ and $2 \le s \le m$, $\alpha \times (y_{s-1}(\alpha), y_s(\alpha))$ and $\alpha' \times (y_{s-1}(\alpha'), y_s(\alpha'))$ are in the same connected component of $F_i \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^i$. For all $\alpha, \beta \in U$, there exists a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \to U$ that connects α and β. Due to the compactness of the path, there are finitely many open sets $B_{\alpha_t}(\delta_t)$ covering $\gamma([0, 1])$ with $\alpha_t \in \gamma([0, 1]), \forall \alpha' \in B_{\alpha_t}(\delta_t), 2 \le j \le m, \alpha \times (y_{j-1}(\alpha), y_j(\alpha))$ and $\alpha' \times (y_{j-1}(\alpha'), y_j(\alpha'))$ are in the same connected component of $F_i \neq 0$. Since the union of these open sets are connected, the lemma is proved. □

Remark 23. By the above Lemma, in Algorithm 2, for any two points $p_l, p'_l \in (k_l, k_{l+1})$, their corresponding sample points obtained through the Open CAD lifting phase are in the same connected component of $F_n \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Since at least one sample point can be taken from every highest dimensional cell via the Open CAD lifting phase, the set of the corresponding sample points of p_l obtained through the Open CAD lifting phase, C_{ln} in Algorithm 2, contains at least one point from every connected component U of $F(X_n, k) \neq 0$, in which $U \bigcap \mathbb{R}^n \times (k_{l-1}, k_l) \neq \emptyset$.

Theorem 24. *The Successive Resultant Method is correct.*

Proof. Let notations be as in Algorithm 2. If there exists a $k' \in (k_i, k_{i+1})$, such that $F(X_n, k') \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then by Lemma 22, for any $k \in (k_i, k_{i+1})$, $F(X_n, k) \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (since their corresponding sample points obtained through the Open CAD lifting phase are in the same connected component of $F_n \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$). Therefore, for any $k \in [k_i, k_{i+1}]$, $F(X_n, k) \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The global optimum k will be found by checking whether $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, F(X_n, p_i) \geq 0$ holds where p_i is the sample point of (k_i, k_{i+1}). Since Algorithm 2 ensures that at least one point is chosen from every connected component of $F_n(X_n, p_i) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the theorem is proved. □

4. Solving Problem 1 via simplified CAD projection

To solve Problem 1, i.e., to prove or disprove $f(X_n) \geq 0$, one may take the following two steps: choose at least one point from each connected open cell defined by $f(X_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and then check whether or not $f(X_n) \geq 0$ at all those sample points. A CAD based method for choosing those sample points need to do projection by, for example, the Brown operator. So, we need to compute discriminant, discriminant of discriminant, and so on. Now, suppose $f(X_n)$ is semi-definite, by Lemma 13, $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_n)$ and $\mathrm{lc}(f, x_n)$ are both semi-definite. By using Lemma 13 again and again, we know that all polynomials appearing in the Brown projection are semi-definite.

Based on this observation, in this section, we will improve Brown's projection for solving Problem 1 from the perspective of maintaining semi-definiteness. A new projection operator `Nproj` is proposed, which avoids some resultants calculation and thus reduces the scale of projection.

4.1. Notations

Definition 25. Suppose $h \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ can be factorized in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$ as:

$$h = l_1^{2j_1-1} l_2^{2j_2-1} \dots l_t^{2j_t-1} {h_1}^{2i_1} {h_2}^{2i_2} \dots {h_m}^{2i_m},$$

where $h_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ and $l_j (i = 1, 2, \dots, t)$ are pairwise different irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. We define $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1, \mathrm{sqrfree}_2$ as follows.

$$\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h) = \{l_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t\},$$
$$\mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h) = \{h_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

Suppose $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ is (positive/negative) semi-definite. To make the following description simpler, we assume f is monic w.r.t. the variable x_n. Let $h = \mathrm{discrim}(f, x_n)$. As discussed at the beginning of this section, we have to choose sample points from every open connected component defined by $\mathrm{sqrfree}(h) = \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h) \bigcup \mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h)$. By Lemma 13, $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_n)$ is semi-definite. We will prove that the polynomials in $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$ are also semi-definite. It will also be shown that for any semi-definite polynomial $g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, $\mathbb{R}^n \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(g)$ is connected. This property guarantees that the open connected components defined by $\mathrm{sqrfree}(h) = \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h) \bigcup \mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h)$ are almost the same as the open connected components defined by $\mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h)$ (may differ with the real roots of $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$). We call a point is "good" if it is not a zero of any polynomial in $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$. Therefore, in order to prove $f \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we only need to choose "good" sample points from every open connected component defined by $\mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h)$ and prove that the polynomials in $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$ are semi-definite. The latter can be solved by recursion. Thus in the CAD projection phase, the resultants of those polynomial pairs of which one is from $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$ and the other from $\mathrm{sqrfree}_2(h)$, as well as the resultants among the polynomials in $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(h)$ are unnecessary.

Having this observation in mind, we propose a new projection operator `Nproj`, the scale of which is no larger than that of Brown's. Based on the new operator, we obtain a new algorithm `Proineq` to prove or disprove inequalities.

We first introduce the principal and secondary parts of the new projection operator `Nproj`.

Definition 26. Given a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_{n+1}]$ with level $n+1$. We define

$$\mathrm{cs}(f, x_{n+1}) = \mathrm{sqrfree}_2(\mathrm{lc}(f, x_{n+1})), \mathrm{ms}(f, x_{n+1}) = \mathrm{sqrfree}_2(\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})).$$

The secondary and principal parts of the new projection are defined as

$$\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_{n+1}) = \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(\mathrm{lc}(f, x_{n+1})) \bigcup \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})),$$

$$\mathtt{Nproj}_p(f, x_{n+1}) = \{ \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathrm{cs}(f, x_{n+1}) \bigcup \mathrm{ms}(f, x_{n+1}),\\ g \notin \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_{n+1})}} g \}.$$

While L is a set of polynomials with level $n+1$, we define

$$\mathtt{Nproj}_s(L, x_{n+1}) = \cup_{f \in L} \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(\mathrm{lc}(f, x_{n+1})) \bigcup \cup_{f \in L} \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_{n+1})),$$

$$\mathtt{Nproj}_p(L, x_{n+1}) = \bigcup_{f \in L} \{ \prod_{\substack{g \in \mathrm{cs}(f, x_{n+1}) \cup \mathrm{ms}(f, x_{n+1}),\\ g \notin \mathtt{Nproj}_s(L, x_{n+1})}} g \}.$$

Now the algorithm `Nproj` is clear and is formally described here.

Algorithm 3. `Nproj`
Input: A polynomial $f(X_n) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$.
Output: A projection factor set (L_1, L_2).

```
$L_2 := \mathrm{sqrfree}_1(f)$;
$L_1 := \{\}$;
for $i$ from $n$ downto 2 do
    $L_1 := L_1 \bigcup \mathtt{Nproj}_p(L_2^i, x_i) \bigcup \mathrm{Bproj}(L_1^i, x_i)$; (Notice that $L^i$ is the set of polynomials in $L$ with level $i$.)
    $L_2 := L_2 \bigcup \mathtt{Nproj}_s(L_2^i, x_i)$;
end for
return $(L_1, L_2)$
```

4.2. The correctness of Algorithm `Proineq`

Theorem 27. *Let f and g be coprime in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. For any connected open set U in $\mathbb{R}^n$, the open set $V = U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(f, g)$ is also connected.*

Algorithm 4. `Proineq`

Input: An irreducible polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$.

Output: Whether or not $\forall X \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(X_n) \geq 0$.

```
$(L_1, L_2) :=$ Nproj$(f)$
for $i$ from 1 to $n$ do
    $C_i$:= An Open CAD of $\mathbb{R}^i$ defined by $\cup_{j=1}^{i} L_1^j \bigcup \cup_{j=1}^{i} L_2^j$;
    if $\exists X_i^1, X_i^2 \in C_i$ and $g \in L_2^i$, s.t., $g(X_i^1)g(X_i^2) < 0$ then
        return false
    end if
    if $\exists X_n^1 \in C_n$, s.t., $f(X_n^1) < 0$ then
        return false
    end if
end for
return true
```

Proof. For any two points α, β in V, we only need to prove that there exists a path $r(t) : [0,1] \to V$ such that $r(0) = \alpha, r(1) = \beta$. Choose a path r_U that connects α and β in U. Notice that U is an open set, so for any $X_n \in r_U$, there exists $\delta_{X_n} > 0$ such that $U \supset B_{X_n}(\delta_{X_n})$. Since r_U is compact and $\bigcup B_{X_n}(\delta_{X_n})$ is an open covering of r_U, there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\bigcup\limits_{k=1}^{m} B_{X_n^k}(\delta_{X_n^k}) \supset r_U$ and $\alpha \in B_{X_n^1}(\delta_{X_n^1})$, $\beta \in B_{X_n^m}(\delta_{X_n^m})$. Now we only need to prove that $B_{X_n^k}(\delta_{X_n^k}) \backslash \text{Zero}(f, g)$ is connected.

Choose $a, b \in B_{X_n^k}(\delta_{X_n^k}) \backslash \text{Zero}(f, g)$. There exists an affine coordinate transformation T such that $T(B_{X_n^k}(\delta_{X_n^k})) = B_{\mathbf{0}_n}(1)$ and $\overrightarrow{T(a)T(b)}$ and $\overrightarrow{(\mathbf{0}_{n-1}, 1)}$ are parallel. Thus the first $n-1$ coordinates of $T(a)$ and $T(b)$ are the same. Let $T(a) = (Y_{n-1}, a')$, $T(b) = (Y_{n-1}, b')$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $a' > b'$.

In the new coordinate, f and g become $T(f)$ and $T(g)$, respectively. $B_{\mathbf{0}_n}(1)$ is an open set and $T(a), T(b) \notin \text{Zero}(T(f), T(g))$, so there exists $r > 0$ such that the cylinder $B_{Y_{n-1}}(r) \times [b', a'] \subseteq B_{\mathbf{0}_n}(1)$, $B_{T(a)}(r) \bigcap \text{Zero}(T(f), T(g)) = \emptyset$ and $B_{T(b)}(r) \bigcap \text{Zero}$ $(T(f), T(g)) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 9, $T(f)$ and $T(g)$ are coprime in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. So by Lemma 10, there exists $X'_{n-1} \in B_{Y_{n-1}}(r)$, such that for any $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $(X'_{n-1}, x_n) \notin \text{Zero}$ $(T(f), T(g))$. Thus the broken line $T(a) \to (X'_{n-1}, a') \to (X'_{n-1}, b') \to T(b)$ is a path that connects $T(a)$ and $T(b)$ in $B_{\mathbf{0}_n}(1) \backslash \text{Zero}(T(f), T(g))$. The theorem is proved. $\square$

Proposition 28. *Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a connected open set, $f, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, $(f, g) = 1$ and for all $X_n \in U$, $f(X_n)g(X_n) \geq 0$. Then $f(X_n) \geq 0, g(X_n) \geq 0$ for all $X_n \in U$ or $f(X_n) \leq 0, g(X_n) \leq 0$ for all $X_n \in U$.*

Proof. If not, there exist X_n^1, $X_n^2 \in U$, such that $f(X_n^1) \leq 0$, $g(X_n^1) \leq 0$ and $f(X_n^2) \geq 0$, $g(X_n^2) \geq 0$. By Theorem 27, $U \backslash \text{Zero}(f, g)$ is connected. So we can choose a path γ that connects X_n^1 with X_n^2 and $\gamma \bigcap \text{Zero}(f, g) = \emptyset$. Consider the sign of $f + g$ on γ. Since the sign is different at X_n^1 and X_n^2, by Mean Value Theorem we know there exists X_n^3 on γ such that $f(X_n^3) + g(X_n^3) = 0$. From the condition we know that $f(X_n)g(X_n) \geq 0$, hence $X_n^3 \in \text{Zero}(f, g)$, which contradicts the choice of γ. $\square$

Proposition 29. *Given a non-zero squarefree polynomial* $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ *and a connected open set* U *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, if* $f(X_n) \geq 0$ *for all* $X_n \in U$*, then* $U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(f)$ *is also a connected open set.*

Proof. Since f is non-zero, we only need to consider the case that the level of f is non-zero. Let $i > 0$ be the level of f and consider f as a polynomial of x_i. Because $f(X_n) \geq 0$ on U, we know $\mathrm{Zero}(f) \bigcap U = \mathrm{Zero}(f, f'_{x_i}) \bigcap U$.

If f is irreducible in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$, f and f'_{x_i} are coprime in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$. Thus $U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(f, f'_{x_i})$ is connected by Theorem 27. So $U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(f)$ is a connected open set.

If f is reducible in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$, let $f = \prod_{t=1}^{j} f_t$, in which all $f_t (t = 1, \ldots, j)$ are irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_n]$, then $U \backslash \mathrm{Zero}(f) = U \backslash \bigcup_{t=1}^{j} \mathrm{Zero}(f_t)$ is a connected open set. The proposition is proved. □

Theorem 30. *Given a positive integer* $n \geq 2$*. Let* $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ *be a non-zero squarefree polynomial and* U *be a connected component of* $\mathtt{Nproj}_p(f, x_n) \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$*. If the polynomials in* $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$ *are semi-definite on* U*, then for* α*,* $\beta \in U \backslash \bigcup_{h \in \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f,x_n)} \mathrm{Zero}(h)$*, the corresponding points in adjacent real roots of* $f(\alpha, x_n) = 0$ *and* $f(\beta, x_n) = 0$ *are in the same connected component of* $f \neq 0$*.*

Proof. By Proposition 29, $U \backslash \bigcup_{h \in \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f,x_n)} \mathrm{Zero}(h)$ is also a connected open set. So α, β are two points in the same connected component of $\mathrm{Bproj}(f, x_n) \neq 0$. By Lemma 22, the corresponding points in adjacent real roots of $f(\alpha, x_n) = 0$ and $f(\beta, x_n) = 0$ are in the same connected component of $f \neq 0$. □

Theorem 31. *Given a positive integer* $n \geq 2$*. Let* $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ *be a squarefree polynomial with level* n *and* U *be a connected open set of* $\mathtt{Nproj}_p(f, x_n) \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$*. The necessary and sufficient condition for* $f(X_n)$ *to be semi-definite on* $U \times \mathbb{R}$ *is the following two conditions hold.*
(1) *The polynomials in* $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$ *are semi-definite on* U*.*
(2) *For an arbitrary point* $\alpha \in U \backslash \bigcup_{h \in \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f,x_n)} \mathrm{Zero}(h)$*,* $f(\alpha, x_n)$ *is semi-definite on* $\mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. $\Longrightarrow$: By Lemma 13, $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x_n)$ is semi-definite on U. Thus by Proposition 28, the polynomials in $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$ are semi-definite on U. It is obvious that $f(\alpha, x_n)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}$.

$\Longleftarrow$: If the polynomials in $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$ are semi-definite on U, by Theorem 30, $U \backslash \bigcup_{h \in \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f,x_n)} \mathrm{Zero}(h)$ is a connected open set. From that $f(\alpha, x_n)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}$, we know that $f(X_n)$ is semi-definite on $U \times \mathbb{R}$. □

The following theorem is an easy corollary of the above theorem.

Theorem 32. *Given a squarefree polynomial* $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$ *with level* n*, the necessary and sufficient condition for* $f(X_n)$ *to be semi-definite on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *is the following two conditions hold.*
(1) *The polynomials in* $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$ *are semi-definite on* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$*.*
(2) *If* $\alpha_i (i = 1, 2)$ *are two arbitrary points from any two different connected components of* $\mathtt{Nproj}_p(f, x_n) \neq 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ *and* α_i *is not a zero of any polynomial in* $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(f, x_n)$*, then* $f(\alpha_i, x_n) \geq 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$ *for all* $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ *or* $f(\alpha_i, x_n) \leq 0$ $(i = 1, 2)$ *for all* $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

Similar to the CAD lifting phase described in (Arnon et al., 1984) and (Brown, 2001), Algorithm 4 proves (or disproves) the inequality $f(X_n) \geq 0$ by testing the sample points computed by Open CAD. From Theorem 32, we know that Algorithm 4 is correct.

5. Solving Problems 2 and 3

This section mainly considers Problem 2 and Problem 3 put forward in the introduction. Without loss of generality, we only need to consider the case that the given polynomial is squarefree.

We first propose an algorithm, named `Findk`, for solving Problem 3, which is based on our new projection operator `Nproj`. For a given $f(X_n, k)$, by `Nproj`(f), we can obtain a polynomial $P(k)$ in k. Assume $k_i (1 \leq i \leq m)$ are the real roots of $P(k)$. We only need to check whether or not $f(X_n, k) \geq 0$ holds at those k_is and on the $m+1$ open intervals. The algorithm is formally described as Algorithm 5 and its correctness will be proved in Theorem 34.

Lemma 33. *In Algorithm 5,*
(1) *For any polynomial $f_i(X_i, k)$ in L_1^i, C_{li} contains at least one point from every connected component U of $f_i(X_i, k) \neq 0$, in which $U \bigcap \mathbb{R}^i \times (k_{l-1}, k_l) \neq \emptyset$;*
(2) *When $0 \leq i \leq n$, for any polynomial $g_i(X_i, k)$ in L_2^i, if $p_l \in GK_f$, then $g_i(X_i, k)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^i \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$. Herein, $GK_f = FK_f \cup FK_{-f}$.*

Proof. (1) It can be easily deduced from Remark 23.

(2) We prove it by induction on i. When $i = 0$, the conclusion is obvious. When $i = 1$, by Theorem 31, it is also true. Assume the conclusion is true when $i = j-1 (j \geq 2)$. For any polynomial $g_j(X_j, k)$ in L_2^j, notice that $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(g_j) \subseteq L_2^{j-1}$, $\mathtt{Nproj}_p(g_j) \subseteq L_1^{j-1}$. If $p_l \in GK_{g_j}$, from the process of the algorithm, we know that $p_l \in GK_g$ for any polynomial g in $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(g_j)$. So by the assumption of induction, we know that every polynomial in $\mathtt{Nproj}_s(g_j)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^{j-1} \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$. By (1) and Theorem 31, $g_j(X_j, k)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^j \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$. That finishes the induction. □

Theorem 34. *The output of Algorithm 5, FK_f, is $\{k | \forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(X_n, k) \geq 0\}$.*

Proof. Denote $\{k | \forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(X_n, k) \geq 0\}$ by K_f.

We first prove that $FK_f \subseteq K_f$. It is sufficient to prove that if $p_l \in GK_f$, then f is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$. Notice that $f \in L_2^n$, so this follows from Lemma 33(2).

We then prove that $K_f \subseteq FK_f$. It is sufficient to prove that if there exists $k' \in (k_{l-1}, k_l)$ such that $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(X_n, k') \geq 0$, then $(k_{l-1}, k_l) \in FK_f$.

It is obviously true when $n = 1$. When $n \geq 2$, for any polynomial $g_{n-1}(X_{n-1}, k)$ in L_2^{n-1}, $\mathrm{sqrfree}_1(g_{n-1}(X_{n-1}, k')) \subseteq \mathtt{Nproj}_s(f(X_n, k'), x_n)$. If $f(X_n, k')$ is squarefree, because $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(X_n, k') \geq 0$, by Theorem 32, $g_{n-1}(X_{n-1}, k')$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. When $f(X_n, k')$ is not squarefree, $g_{n-1}(X_{n-1}, k') \equiv 0$ and it is also semi-definite. So $g_{n-1}(X_{n-1}, k')$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. In a similar way, we know that for any $1 \leq j \leq n-1$ and any polynomial $g_j(X_j, k)$ in L_2^j, $g_j(X_j, k)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^j \times k'$.

If the algorithm is incorrect, then there exists a minimal i and $g_i(X_i, k) \in L_2^i$, such that $p_l \notin GK_{g_i}$. If such g_i is not unique, then choose any one. If $i = 1$, it contradicts

Algorithm 5. Findk
Input: A squarefree polynomial $f(X_n, k) \in \mathbb{R}[X_n, k]$.
Output: The set $FK_f = \{k | \forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n, f(X_n, k) \geq 0\}$.

```
$FK_f := \{\}$;
$(L_1, L_2) :=$ Nproj$(f)$;
$C_0 :=$ a CAD of $\mathbb{R}$ defined by $L_1^0 \bigcup L_2^0$; (Suppose $C_0 = \cup_{i=1}^m \{p_i\} \cup_{i=1}^m \{k_i\}$ where $k_i (1 \leq i \leq m)$ are the real roots of $L_1^0 \cup L_2^0$, $k_0 = -\infty, k_{m+1} = +\infty$, $p_i \in (k_i, k_{i+1})$. $L^i$ is the set of polynomials in $L$ with level $i$.)
for $l$ from 0 to $m$ do
    Choose sample point $p_l$ of $(k_l, k_{l+1})$;
    $v := 1$;
    for $i$ from 1 to $n$ do
        $C_{li}$:=an Open CAD of $\mathbb{R}^i$ defined by $\cup_{j=1}^i L_1^j \bigcup \cup_{j=1}^i L_2^j, k = p_l$;
        if $\exists X_i^1, X_i^2 \in C_{li}$, $g \in L_2^i$, s.t. $g(X_i^1, p_l) g(X_i^2, p_l) < 0$ then
            $v := 0$;
            break
        end if
        if $i = n$ and $\exists X_n \in C_{ln}$, s.t. $f(X_n, p_l) < 0$ then
            $v := 0$;
        end if
    end for
    if $v = 1$ then
        $FK_f := FK_f \bigcup (k_l, k_{l+1})$;
    end if
end for
for $i$ from 1 to $m$ do
    if Proineq$(f(X_n, k_i))$ =true then
        $FK_f := FK_f \bigcup \{k_i\}$;
    end if
end for
return $FK_f$
```

Theorem 31. Hence $i \geq 2$. From the definition of i we know that $p_l \in GK_g$ for any polynomial g in $\texttt{Nproj}_s(g_i)$. By Lemma 33(2), every polynomial of $\texttt{Nproj}_s(g_i)$ is semi-definite on $\mathbb{R}^{i-1} \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$. By Lemma 33(1), for any polynomial f_{i-1} in L_1^{i-1}, C_{li} contains at least one point from every connected component U of $f_{i-1} \neq 0$ in which $U \bigcap \mathbb{R}^{i-1} \times (k_{l-1}, k_l) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by Theorem 30, the indefiniteness of $g_i(X_i, k)$ on the sample points of $\mathbb{R}^i \times (k_{l-1}, k_l)$ will lead to the indefiniteness of $g_i(X_i, k')$, which is a contradiction. The proof is completed. □

By modifying the algorithm `Findk`, we get the algorithm `Findmax` which can solve the global optimum problem (Problem 2).

6. Examples

In this section, we will illustrate the process and efficiency of algorithms `Findmax`, `Findk` and `Proineq` with several non-trivial examples.

Algorithm 6. `Findmax`
Input: A squarefree polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$.
Output: $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $k = \inf_{X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(X_n)$.

```
1:  $L := \{\}$
2:  $(L_1, L_2) :=$ Nproj$(f(X_n) - k)$
3:  $C_0$ :=a CAD of $\mathbb{R}$ defined by $L_1^0 \bigcup L_2^0$. ($C_0 = \cup_{0=1}^{m}\{p_i\} \bigcup \cup_{i=1}^{m}\{k_i\}$, $k_0 = -\infty, k_{m+1} = +\infty$, $p_i \in (k_i, k_{i+1})$)
4:  for $l$ from 0 to $m$ do
5:      Choose sample point $p_l$ of $(k_l, k_{l+1})$
6:      $v := 1$;
7:      for $i$ from 1 to $n$ do
8:          $C_{li}$:=an Open CAD of $\mathbb{R}^i$ defined by $\cup_{j=1}^{i} L_1^j \bigcup \cup_{j=1}^{i} L_2^j$ and $k = p_l$;
9:          if $\exists X_i^1, X_i^2 \in C_{li}, g \in L_2^i$, s.t. $g(X_i^1, k)g(X_i^2, k) < 0$ then
10:             $v := 0$;
11:             break
12:         end if
13:         if $i = n$ and $\exists X_n \in Cl_n$, s.t. $f(X_n) - p_l < 0$ then
14:             $v := 0$;
15:         end if
16:     end for
17:     if $v = 0$ then
18:         return $k_l$
19:     end if
20: end for
21: return $k_{m+1}$
```

Remark 35. For $f, g \in \mathbb{R}[X_n]$, $\forall X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $g(X_n) \geq 0$, algorithm `Findmax` can also be applied to compute $\inf\{\frac{f(X_n)}{g(X_n)} | X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$. We just need to replace $(L_1, L_2) :=$ `Nproj`$(f(X_n) - k)$ of step 2 by $(L_1, L_2) :=$ `Nproj`$(f(X_n) - kg(X_n))$.

Algorithm `Findmax` will be compared with the algorithm `SRes`. The program *Proineq* we implemented using Maple will be compared with the function PartialCylindricalAlgebraicDecomposition of RegularChains package in Maple15.

All computations were performed on a laptop with Inter Core2 2.10GHz CPU and 2.00GB RAM.

Since our main contribution is the new projection operator `Nproj`, for the following example, we will mainly focus on how the projection phase of algorithm `Findmax` differs from that of algorithm `SRes`.

Example 6.1. Compute $\inf_{x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}} G(x, y, z)$, where

$$G = \frac{(x^2 - x + 1)(y^2 - y + 1)(z^2 - z + 1)}{(xyz)^2 - xyz + 1}.$$

Since for any $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(xyz)^2 - xyz + 1 \geq 0,$$

so this problem can be solved either by algorithm `Findmax`or algorithm `SRes`. We will apply algorithm `Findmax` and algorithm `SRes` to solve this problem, respectively.

1. Algorithm `Findmax`.

Projection phase.

Notice that in the projection phase of `Findmax`, we call algorithm `Nproj`.

For the first step, $L_2 := \{f\}$, $L_1 := \{\}$, where

$$f := (x^2 - x + 1)(y^2 - y + 1)(z^2 - z + 1) - k((xyz)^2 - xyz + 1).$$

Now we step into the loop of algorithm `Nproj`.

When $i := 3$, we regard f as a polynomial in x. Then $\mathrm{lc}(f, x) = f_1$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f, x) = f_2$. So $L_1^2 := \{\}$, $L_2^2 := \{f_1, f_2\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 :=& (y^2 - y + 1)(z^2 - z + 1) - ky^2z^2,\\
f_2 :=& -3(1 - 2z - \frac{4}{3}k - 2y + 3y^2 + 3z^2 - \frac{2}{3}kyz + 9y^2z^2\\
&- 6y^2z - 6yz^2 + 4yz - 2ky^2z^2 + z^4y^4 - 2y^4z^3\\
&+ 3y^4z^2 - 2y^3z^4 + 4y^3z^3 - 6y^3z^2 + 3y^2z^4\\
&- 6y^2z^3 - 2y^4z + 4y^3z - 2yz^4 + 4yz^3 + \frac{4}{3}kz\\
&+ \frac{4}{3}ky - \frac{4}{3}ky^2 - \frac{4}{3}kz^2 + k^2y^2z^2\\
&+ \frac{2}{3}ky^2z + \frac{2}{3}kyz^2 - \frac{4}{3}kz^4y^4\\
&+ \frac{4}{3}ky^4z^3 - \frac{4}{3}ky^4z^2 + \frac{4}{3}ky^3z^4\\
&- \frac{2}{3}ky^3z^3 + \frac{2}{3}ky^3z^2 - \frac{4}{3}ky^2z^4\\
&+ \frac{2}{3}ky^2z^3 + \frac{2}{3}ky^3z + \frac{2}{3}kyz^3 + y^4\\
&+ z^4 - 2z^3 - 2y^3).
\end{aligned}$$

When $i := 2$, we regard f_1, f_2 as polynomials in y. Then $\mathrm{lc}(f_1, y) = f_{11}$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_1, y) = f_{12}f_{13}$, $\mathrm{lc}(f_2, y) = f_{21}f_{22}$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_2, y) = 2304f_{21}^2f_{22}f_{23}^3f_{24}^4$. Notice that $f_{13} = f_{21}$, so $L_1 := \{f_{24}\}$, $L_2^1 := \{f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{13}, f_{22}, f_{23}\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{11} :=& -(kz^2 - z^2 + z - 1),\\
f_{12} :=& -3z^2 + 4kz^2 + 3z - 3,\\
f_{13} :=& z^2 - z + 1,\\
f_{21} :=& z^2 - z + 1,\\
f_{22} :=& 9z^4k^3 - 24z^6k^2 - 21z^5k^2 - 3z^4k^2 - 21z^3k^2\\
&- 24z^2k^2 + 16kz^8 - 4kz^7 + 16kz^6 + 32kz^5 - 8kz^4\\
&+ 32kz^3 + 16kz^2 - 4kz + 16k - 9z^8 + 9z^7 - 9z^6 - 18z^5\\
&+ 18z^4 - 18z^3 - 9z^2 + 9z - 9,\\
f_{23} :=& -1 + 2z - 3z^2 + 2z^3 - z^4 + kz^2,\\
f_{24} :=& k.
\end{aligned}$$

When $i := 1$, we regard f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{13}, f_{22} and f_{23} as polynomials in z. Then $\mathrm{lc}(f_{11}, z) = 1 - k$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_{11}, z) = -3 + 4k$; $\mathrm{lc}(f_{12}, z) = -3 + 4k$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_{12}, z) = 3(-9 + 16k)$; $\mathrm{lc}(f_{13}, z) = 1$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_{13}, z) = -3$; $\mathrm{lc}(f_{22}, z) = -9 + 16k$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_{22}, z) = 531441(-1 + k)(k - 9)(3k - 2)^2(k^2 + 6k - 3)^2(256k - 279)^6k^{14}$; $\mathrm{lc}(f_{23}, z) = -1$, $\mathrm{discrim}(f_{23}, z) = 16k^2(-1 + k)(k - 9)$. So

$$L_1^0 = \{3k - 2, k^2 + 6k - 3, 256k - 279, k\}, \quad L_2^0 = \{1 - k, -3 + 4k, -9 + 16k, k - 9\}.$$

Thus, the projection phase is finished. We get a polynomial in k defined by $L_1^0 \bigcup L_2^0$,

$$g := (3k - 2)(k^2 + 6k - 3)(256k - 279)k(1 - k)(-3 + 4k)(-9 + 16k)(k - 9).$$

By real root isolation, we get 10 sample points defined by $L_1^0 \bigcup L_2^0$,

$$[[\frac{-17}{2}], [-2], [\frac{1}{8}], [\frac{17}{32}], [\frac{19}{32}], [\frac{23}{32}], [\frac{7}{8}], [\frac{33}{32}], [\frac{73}{16}], [\frac{33}{2}]].$$

After testing these points, we know that the maximum k is the real root of $k^2 + 6k - 3$, which is between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$.

2. Successive resultant method

Projection phase.

Notice that in the projection phase of the Successive Resultant Method, we call algorithm 1 (Bprojection).

In the first step, $F := \{f\}$, where

$$f = (x^2 - x + 1)(y^2 - y + 1)(z^2 - z + 1) - k((xyz)^2 - xyz + 1).$$

Now we step into the loop of algorithm Bprojection.

When $i := 3$, we regard f as a polynomial in x. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Res}(f, f', x) = f_1 f_2, \\ &F_2 := \mathrm{sqrfree}(\mathrm{Res}(f, f', x)) = f_1 f_2. \end{aligned}$$

When $i := 2$, we regard f as a polynomial in y. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Res}(F_2, F_2', y) = 2304k^{12}z^8 f_{11} f_{12}^2 f_{13}^8 f_{22} f_{23}^7, \\ &F_1 := \mathrm{sqrfree}(\mathrm{Res}(F_2, F_2', y)) = kz f_{11} f_{12} f_{13} f_{22} f_{23}. \end{aligned}$$

When $i := 1$, we regard f as a polynomial in z. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Res}(F_1, F_1', z) = &-1156831381426176k^{125}(-9 + 16k)^4(-3 + 4k)^2 \\ &(k^4 - 294k^3 + 1425k^2 - 2277k + 1089)^2(-1 + k)^5 \\ &(614656k^4 - 4409856k^3 + 11013408k^2 - 11477376k + 4021893)^2 \\ &(3k - 2)^2(k^2 + 6k - 3)^2(256k - 279)^6(k - 9)^{14}(4k - 9)^4, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 :=&\mathrm{sqrfree}(\mathrm{Res}(F_1, F_1', z)) = g(k^4 - 294k^3 + 1425k^2 - 2277k + 1089)(4k - 9) \\ &(614656k^4 - 4409856k^3 + 11013408k^2 - 11477376k + 4021893). \end{aligned}$$

The maximum k is a real root of F_0. By real root isolation, we get 15 sample points of k defined by F_0,

$$[[\frac{-17}{2}], [-2], [\frac{7}{32}], [\frac{33}{64}], [\frac{39}{64}], [\frac{87}{128}], [\frac{47}{64}], [\frac{25}{32}], [\frac{15}{16}], [\frac{33}{32}], [\frac{25}{16}], [\frac{11}{4}], [\frac{23}{4}], [136], [\frac{1025}{2}]].$$

After testing these points, we know that the maximum k is the real root of k^2+6k-3, which is between $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$.

Obviously, the scale of projection with the new projection is smaller. The polynomial in k calculated through the successive resultant method has three extraneous factors.

Example 6.2. Let $X_4 \in \mathbb{R}^4$, prove or disprove

$$(\forall X_4 \in \mathbb{R}^4) \quad f(X_4) = (\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i^2)^2 - \frac{3017}{1000} \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i^3 x_{i+1} \geq 0,$$

where $x_5 = x_1$.

Notice that $f(1,1,1,1) = \frac{983}{250} > 0$, it is a non-trivial example. When we use `Proineq` to prove or disprove $f \geq 0$, after 0.921 seconds, `Proineq` returns false. If we use PartialCylindricalAlgebraicDecomposition, it needs 2.187 seconds.

Actually, the maximum value of k satisfying the following inequality,

$$(\forall X_4 \in \mathbb{R}^4) \quad f(X_4, k) = (\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i^2)^2 - k \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i^3 x_{i+1} \geq 0,$$

is $-\frac{8}{27} + \frac{40}{27}\sqrt{5}$, which is between $\frac{3017}{1000}$ and $\frac{3016}{1000}$.

Example 6.3. (Han, 2011) Let $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$F(X_n, n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (x_i^2 + n - 1) - n^{n-2} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i)^2 \geq 0.$$

When $n = 3, 4, 5, 6$, we compared PartialCylindricalAlgebraicDecomposition($PCAD$) with `Proineq`.

n	PCAD		`Proineq`	
	Time (seconds)	Number of sample points	Time (seconds)	Number of sample points
3	0.078	4	0.063	3
4	0.250	10	0.422	3
5	2.282	36	0.875	5
6	>3000	Unknown	4.188	15

Example 6.4. Let $X_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 3, 4, 5$, then

$$(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2)^2 \geq 3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^3 x_{i+1},$$

where $x_{n+1} = x_1$.

We notice that the inequality is homogenous, thus we can assume that $x_n = 1$. Now we compare PartialCylindricalAlgebraicDecomposition($PCAD$) with `Proineq`.

n	PCAD		`Proineq`	
	Time (seconds)	Number of sample points	Time (seconds)	Number of sample points
3	0.032	5	0.047	5
4	0.469	2	0.171	2
5	>3000	Unknown	244.188	20

Example 6.5. Let $y_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$, prove that

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^{8} (y_i^2 (y_i^2 - y_{i+1}^2 + y_{i+2}^2 + y_{i+3}^2 - y_{i+4}^2 + y_{i+5}^2 + y_{i+6}^2 - y_{i+7}^2)) \geq 0,$$

where $y_{j+8} = y_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 7$.

It takes 27.218 seconds for Proineq to prove that $F \geq 0$ after checking 6720 sample points. PCAD cannot obtain result on this example within one hour.

The above three examples demonstrate that in terms of proving inequalities, algorithm `Proineq` is efficient. Further improvements on the projection and lifting phase are our ongoing work.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all members in the symbolic computation seminar of Peking University, including Liyun Dai who simplified the proof of Proposition 28, Xiaoxuan Tang, Zhenghong Chen and Ting Gan, who together checked the proofs.

References

Arnon D, Collins G, McCallum S. Cylindrical algebraic decomposition I:The basic algorithm. SIAM Journal of Computing. 13(04),865–877, 1984.

Artin E, Über die Zerlegung definiter Funktionen in Quadrate, Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg Univ. 5 (1927), 100–115.

Berg C, Maserick P H. Polynomially positive definite sequences. Math Ann, 1982, 259: 487–495.

Bernstein S. Sur la représentation des polynômes positif. Soobshch Har'k Mat Obshch, 1915, 2: 227–228.

Brown C W. Improved projection for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. J.Symbolic Computation, 2011,32: 447–465.

Castle M, Powers V, Reznick B, Pólyas theorem with zeros. J Symbolic Comput, 2011, 46: 1039–1048.

Collins, G. E. Quantifier Elimination for the Elementary Theory of Real Closed Fields by Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition. Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. 33, 134–183, 1975.

Collins, G. E. Quantifier Elimination by Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition–Twenty Years of Progress. In Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (Ed. B. F. Caviness and J. R. Johnson). New York: Springer-Verlag, 8–23, 1998.

Collins, G. E. and Hong, H. Partial Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition for Quantifier Elimination. J. Symb. Comput. 12, 299–328, 1991.

Guo, F., Safey El Din, M, Zhi, L. Global optimization of polynomials using generalized critical values and sums of squares. In: Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. 107–114, 2010.

Hà H.V., Pha.m, T.S. Solving polynomial optimization problems via the truncated tangency variety and sums of squares. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 213 (11), 2167–2176, 2009. `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpaa.2009.03.014.`

Hägglöf, Lindberg P.O., Stevenson L. Computing global minima to polynomial optimization problems using Gröbner bases. J Global Optimization, 1995, 7: 115–125.

Han J J. An Introduction to the Proving of Elementary Inequalities. Harbin: Harbin Institute of Technology Press, 2011, 221.(in Chinese)

Hanzon B, Jibetean D. Global minimization of a multivariate polynomial using matrix methods. J Global Optimization, 2003, 27: 1–23.

Hardy G H, Littlewood J E, Pólya G. Inequalities. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Hilbert D, Über die Darstellung definiter Formen als Summe von Formenquadraten. Math Ann, 1888, 32: 342–350. `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01443605.`

Hong H. An improvement of the projection operator in cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, 261–264, 1990.

D. Jibetean and M. Laurent. Semidefinite approximations for global unconstrained polynomial optimization. SIAM J. on Optimization, 16(2):490–514, 2005.

Lasserre, J.: Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments. SIAM J. on Optimization, 11(3), 796–817 (2001)

McCallum, S. An improved projection operation for cylindrical algebraic decomposition of three-dimensional space. J.Symbolic Computation., 1988, 5:141–161.

McCallum, S. An improved projection operation for cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In Caviness, B.,Johnson, J. eds, Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition, Texts and Monographs in Symbolic Computation. Vienna, Springer-Verlag, 242–268, 1998.

McCallum, S. Solving polynomial strict inequalities using cylindrical algebraic decomposition. Comput. J., 36, 432–438, 1993.

Motzkin T S. Copositive quadratic forms. Natl Bur Stand Rep, 1952, 1818: 11–22.

Motzkin T S, Strauss E G. Divisors of polynomials and power series with positive coefficients. Pacific J Math, 1969, 29: 641–652.

Nie, J., Demmel, J., Sturmfels, B., 2006. Minimizing polynomials via sum of squares over the gradient ideal. Math. Program. 106 (3, Ser. A), 587–606. `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10107-005-0672-6.`

Parrilo, P.A., 2000. Structured semidefinite programs and semialgebraic geometry methods in robustness and optimization. Dissertation (Ph.D.), California Institute of Technology. `http://resolver.caltech.edu/CaltechETD:etd-05062004-055516.`

Pólya, G. über positive Darstellung von Polynomen. Vierteljahrschrift Naturforsch. Ges. Zürich 73, 1928, 141–145.

Putinar M. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. Indiana Univ Math J, 1993, 42: 969–984.

M. Safey El Din. Computing the global optimum of a multivariate polynomial over the reals. ISSAC 2008 Proceedings, D. Jeffrey (eds), Austria (Hagenberg), 2008, 71–78.

Scheiderer C. Positivity and Sums of Squares: A Guide to Recent Results, Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry (M. Putinar, S. Sullivant, eds.), IMA Volumes Math. Appl. 149, New York-Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2009, 271–324.

Schweighofer M. Certificates for nonnegativity of polynomials with zeros on compact semi-algebraic sets. Manuscripta Math, 2005, 117: 407–428.

Strzeboński, A. Solving systems of strict polynomial inequalities. J. Symbolic Comput. 29, 471–480, 2000.

Weiss,E. Algebraic Number Theory. New York: McGrawHill, 1963: 166.

Wu W T, On Global-Optimization Problems, Proc. ASCM'98, Lanzhou: Lanzhou University Press, 1998: 135–138.

Wu W T, Mathematics Mechanization, Beijing: Science Press, 2003(in Chinese).

Xia B, DISCOVERER: A tool for solving problems involving polynomial inequalities. In: Proc. ATCM'2000 (W-C Yang, et al. eds.), 472–481, ATCM Inc., Blacksburg, USA, Dec, 2000.

Xiao R. Parametric Polynomial Systems Solving. Dissertation (Ph.D.), Peking University, 2009.

Xiao S J, Zeng G X. Algorithms for computing the global infimum and minimum of a polynomial function (in Chinese). Sci Sin Math, 2011, 41(9): 759–788, `doi:10.1360/012010-977`.

Xu J, Yao Y. Pólya's method and the successive difference substitution method (in Chinese). Sci Sin Math, 2012, 42(3): 203–213, `doi:10.1360/012011-684`.

Yang L. Symbolic algorithm for global optimization and principle of finite kernel. In: Mathematics and Mathematical Mechanization (Lin D. ed.) (in Chinese), 210–220, 2001.

Yang L. Solving Harder Problems with Lesser Mathematics. Proceedings of the 10th Asian Technology Conference in Mathmematics, Blacksburg: ATCM Inc, 2005: 37–46.

Yang L, Xia B C. Automated Proving and Discovering on Inequalities, Beijing: Science Press, 2008: 131–138 (in Chinese).

Yao Y. Infinite product convergence of column stochastic mean matrix and machine decision for positive semi-definite forms (in Chinese). Sci Sin Math, 2010, 53(3): 251–264.